

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/662,399	09/14/2000	Nagender P. Vedula	MS147164.1	1314	
27195 7	590 11/26/2003		EXAM	INER	
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP			BASOM, E	BASOM, BLAINE T	
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
1900 EAST NI CLEVELAND		•	2173	THE ENTONIBER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/662,399	VEDULA ET AL.				
·	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Blaine Basom	2173				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mote armed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	l be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme						
O. Other:						
		74				
		JOHN CABECA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE				
		TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicants raise the same or similar arguments as those presented in the Applicants' previous response, which was filed on 6/24/2003. For example, the Applicants argue that Oppenhiem does not teach a function object for creating a mapping between a target object and a source object, and that Oppenhiem does not teach a function object having a script component for performing a function. For the reasons presented in the Examiner's previous Office Action, mailed 9/10/2003, the Examiner disagrees with these arguments.